APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,181	11/10/2003	Ian D. Hegerty	5598/154US	4662

7590	01/23/2006

Seth Ostrow
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder and Steiner LLP
900 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022-4728

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*17 November 2005*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, see remarks/arguments, filed 17 November 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly cited references. See rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-5 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (2005/0114484) and Schuetze et al. (6,941,321).

4.   As per claim 1, Wi teaches a method of determining a countrytag for a website on a network (see Wi, page 7, claim 1), comprising: determining a first set of hosts that have country code domains (see Wi, ¶ 27); determining which hosts of websites on the network are of interest to users in a particular geographical location (see Wi, ¶ 22), and determining which of the websites on the network is of interest to users in a particular geographical location (see Wi, ¶ 25). But fails to teach looking at inlinks to the first set of hosts; adding the hosts determined to be of interest to the first set of hosts to create an

augmented set of hosts; looking at inlinks to the augmented set of hosts. However, Sc

teaches looking at inlinks to the first set of hosts (see Sc, col. 18, line 54-col. 19, line 2);

adding the hosts determined to be of interest to the first set of hosts to create an

augmented set of hosts (see Sc, col. 8, lines 5-15); looking at inlinks to the augmented

set of hosts (see Sc, col. 10, line 65-col. 11, line 5). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi to looking at

inlinks to the first set of hosts; adding the hosts determined to be of interest to the first

set of hosts to create an augmented set of hosts; looking at inlinks to the augmented set

of hosts in order to advantageously employ a framework to enhance browsing,

searching, retrieving and recommending content in a collection of documents (see Sc,

col. 5, lines 43-47).

5.   As per claim 2, Wi and Sc teach a method, wherein the country code domain of

the first set of hosts is a top-level domain (see Wi, ¶ 24).

6.   As per claim 3, Wi and Sc teach a method, further comprising: crawling the

network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-

level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites (see Wi, ¶ 39: wherein searching

serves the function of crawling).

7.   As per claim 4, Wi and Sc teach a method, wherein the network is the Internet

(see Wi, ¶ 27).

8.   As per claim 5, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above, but

Wi fails to teach a method, wherein the network is an intranet. However, Sc teaches a

method, wherein the network is an intranet (see Sc, col. 10, lines 9-18). It would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Wi to a method, wherein the network is an intranet to serve a company's internal

purposes (see Sc, col. 1, lines 35-40).

9.   As per claim 20, Wi and Sc teach a method, wherein a different test is used to

determine if a website should be assigned a "US" countrytag than is used for assigning

countrytags of non-US countries (see Wi, ¶ 9).

10.   As per claim 21, Wi and Sc teach a method, wherein a website can be assigned

more than one countrytag (see Wi, ¶ 82).

11.   Claims 6-9, 11, 13, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wi and Sc as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pitkow

et al. (2002/0016786).

12.   As per claim 6, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but

fail to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the first set

of hosts further looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites. However, Pi teaches a

method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the first set of hosts further

looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites (see Pi, ¶ 121). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to

a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the first set of hosts

further looks at inlinks to globally hosted websites in order to build up a relevance profile

for each individual and/or group and map that profile in accordance with a determined

relevance model to collection content (see Pi, ¶ 120).

13.   As per claim 7, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but

fail to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the

augmented set of hosts further looks at inlinks to and outlinks from globally hosted

websites. However, Pi teaches a method, wherein the determining step that looks at

inlinks to the augmented set of hosts further looks at inlinks to and outlinks from globally

hosted websites (see Pi, ¶ 122). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, wherein the

determining step that looks at inlinks to the augmented set of hosts further looks at

inlinks to and outlinks from globally hosted websites in order to build up a relevance

profile for each individual and/or group and map that profile in accordance with a

determined relevance model to collection content (see Pi, ¶ 120).

14.   As per claim 8, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but

fail to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the first set

of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the

following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level

domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of

unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a

predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-

level domain. However, Pi teaches a method, wherein the determining step that looks at

inlinks to the first set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host

when all of the following are true (see Pi, ¶ 107): there are more unique inlinking hosts

from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Pi, ¶ 113), there are

more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Pi, ¶ 118), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain (see Pi, ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the first set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following are true: there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pi, ¶ 2).

15.   As per claim 9, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 8 above but fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10. However, Pi teaches a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 (see Pi, ¶ 118). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pi, ¶ 119).

16.   As per claim 11, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim s 1 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or default document page exists in one and only one ODP country section. However, Pi

teaches a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or default

document page exists in one and only one ODP country section (see Pi, ¶ 118). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Wi and Sc to a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the root or

default document page exists in one and only one ODP country section in order to

provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pi, ¶ 119).

17.   As per claim 13, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but

fail to teach a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the

augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when

all of the following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined

percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a

particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second

predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of

inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value.

However, Pi teachs a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the

augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when

all of the following three tests are true (see Pi, ¶ 107): there are more than a first

predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-

level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a

second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the

number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined

threshold value (see Pi, ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, wherein the determining step that looks at inlinks to the augmented set of hosts further comprises: assigning a countrytag to a global host when all of the following three tests are true: there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from the same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of the non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pi, ¶ 2).

18.   As per claim 16, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set. However, Pi teaches a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set (see Pi, ¶ 103). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, further comprising: before the determining step, summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set in order to provide a user with a "substitute" bookmark when a preferred document is unavailable (see Pi, ¶ 102).

19.   Claims 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wi, Sc, and Pi.

20.   As per claim 10, Wi, Sc, and Pi teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 8

above but Wi and Pi fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is

60%. However, Sc teaches a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60%

(see Sc, col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Wi and Pi to a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is

60% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively

determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities,

and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Sc,

abstract).

21.   As per claim 14, Wi, Sc, and Pi teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and

13 above but Wi and Pi fail to teach a method, wherein the first predetermined

percentage is 40%. However, Sc teaches a method, wherein the first predetermined

percentage is 40% (see Sc, col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined

percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Wi and Pi to a method, wherein the first predetermined

percentage is 40% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population,

quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those

similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of

documents (see Sc, abstract).

22.   As per claim 15, Wi, Sc, and Pi teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and

13 above but Wi and Pi fail to teach a method, wherein the second predetermined

percentage is 32%. However, Sc teaches a method, wherein the second predetermined

percentage is 32% (see Sc, col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined

percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Wi and Pi to a method, wherein the second

predetermined percentage is 32% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user

population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users

according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to

clusters of documents (see Sc, abstract).

23.   Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wi, Sc, and Pi as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Lakritz

(6,526,426).

24.   As per claim 12, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7

above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: assigning a countrytag if the host is

marked for manual countrytagging. However, La teaches a method, further comprising:

assigning a countrytag if the host is marked for manual countrytagging (see La, col. 4,

lines 27-38). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, further comprising: assigning a

countrytag if the host is marked for manual countrytagging in order to allow the most

appropriate language of a requested document to be served to a Web browser (see La, col. 15, lines 59-61).

25.   As per claim 19, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach a method, further including determining a countrytag for a web subsite. However, La teaches a method, further including determining a countrytag for a web subsite (see La, col. 6, lines 28-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, further including determining a countrytag for a web subsite in order to allow a multilingual web site to be built incrementally (see La, col. 6, lines 14-18).

26.   Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wi and Pi.

27.   As per claim 22, Wi teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country (see Wi, ¶ 39), comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following are true (see Wi, ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain. However, Pi teaches there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Pi, ¶ 113), there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Pi, ¶ 118), and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking

hosts from a same country code top-level domain (see Pi, ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi to there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains, there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains, and there are more than a predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain in order for enhancing searches and recommending documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of users (see Pi, ¶ 2).

28.   As per claim 23, Wi teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country (see Wi, ¶ 39), comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following three tests are true (see Wi, ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value. However, Pi teaches there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value (see Pi, ¶ 55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wi to

there are more than a first predetermined percentage of unique inlinking hosts from a

same country code top-level domain, a particular country code top-level domain

accounts for more than a second predetermined percentage of non-global unique

inlinking hosts, and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than

a predetermined threshold value in order for enhancing searches and recommending

documents in a collection through the use of bookmarks shared among a community of

users (see Pi, ¶ 2).

29.   Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wi and Sc as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Page

(6,285,999).

30.   As per claim 17, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7

above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting

value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country. However,

Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a

country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country (see Page, col. 9, lines

15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to modify Wi and Sc to a method, further comprising: adding extra points

to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country

in order to provide a document ranking method that is scalable and can be applied to

extremely large databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).

31.   As per claim 18, Wi and Sc teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7

above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting

value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country. However, Page

teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country

when an IP address of the host is in that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Wi and Sc to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value

for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country in order to provide a

document ranking method that is scalable and can be applied to extremely large

databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571) 272-

7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER